



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tribunals," neither can any one. The same would be true of any lone substantive dangling in the air. But what more palpable is there in the Doctor's phrase, "constructive adjustment of the concrete interests which are already at work"? What concrete, what substantial ore is precipitated by such of his expressions as "particular forces which have to be related," or "objective facts"? What structure remains in the mind after reading: "When intelligence is used to devise mechanism which will afford to the forces at work all the satisfaction that conditions permit"?

The pacifists are pleading with a deafened world to apply its mind unto the lessons of The Hague Conferences and the International Court of Arbitration; unto the Supreme Court of the World, all but established in

1914; unto the long line of successful arbitrations, and unto the wild insanity of war. If, by employing these terms and pleading thuswise, we are "cowards," "poltroons," "emotionalists," "eunuchs"—to use Mr. Roosevelt's gentle words—then our critics will have to make the most of it. And if these terms perchance leave only a vacuum in the minds of our adversaries, surely the trouble cannot be with the terms. "Rules of the road," "a scheme allowing a maximum utilization of energy," constitute the goal of the pacifists, among whom we are sure we must classify Dr. Dewey himself.

Pacifism can stand criticism, both from the inside and from the outside; it needs it and profits by it. Criticism, however, to be constructive, must be more than a mere juggling with words.

## EDITORIAL NOTES

**The Spirit of Lincoln,**  
July 4, 1916.

To paraphrase a classic is a form of violence to which most persons are opposed. We are in receipt, however, of a paraphrasis of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, written by a well-known American patriot, that sets forth a point of view so sane and illuminating that we are glad to present it to our readers.

When Mr. Lincoln made his address at Gettysburg the States of the American Union were engaged in Civil War. The victory at Gettysburg presaged the ultimate success of the North. The question then was, Should the North dominate the South, or should the peoples of the North and the South be reconciled and come together after the war as equals and brethren in a more perfect union? The great President led the American people into the way of brotherhood and union. His words have passed into all lands, and have become the expression and the aspiration of all peoples.

Today the whole world stands at such a crisis in its affairs as did the United States of America in 1863. In 1899, at the conference at The Hague, the nations represented constituted themselves a voluntary Union. From thence all war became civil war. New moral responsibilities arose for all nations; above all, the responsibility to maintain and perfect the union then begun. The war in Europe is thus a civil war. The question will soon arise, Shall the victors dominate the vanquished, or shall the peoples of the warring nations be reconciled and come together after the war as equals and brethren in a more perfect Union?

The 4th of July is the day we celebrate as the birthday of our independence and of our Union. Our independence and our Union we hold not as a means of conquest and domination, but in order to extend the idea of equality and brotherhood among men and of union

among nations. On this day, therefore, we look across the seas with an infinite sympathy not without hope. The spirit of Lincoln appeals to us today as insistently as his living presence did in 1863—that, so far as in us lies, we shall not allow the sacrifice of Europe to be in vain. It calls upon us to extend among the peoples of Europe the same generous and humane sentiments which he expressed in the midst of our Civil War, to the end that the present war may not result in domination and slavery, but in a larger equality, brotherhood, and a more perfect union. This we conceive would have been the summons of Lincoln to the American people of to-day, and our correspondent conceives that Lincoln would express his views somewhat as follows:

"Seventeen years ago the nations assembled brought forth on the continent of Europe a Union of the Nations, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all nations are created equal. Now on that continent nations are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Union or any union so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

"We are not far from the battlefields of that war, the final resting-place of many who have given their lives that their nations may live. We are come together in peace to honor the day on which our Union was born, and to rejoice in its abundant life. We turn our thoughts perforce in counsel how we may dedicate this nation to the healing and preservation of the great Union of the Nations. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, this nation to this high purpose. The brave and pious men who made and saved our union have consecrated it to the cause of union and peace throughout the world, beyond our power to add or detract. The world may little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

"It is for us rather to be dedicated to the unfinished

work which they, our forefathers, so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the greater task remaining before us—that from their honored lives we take increased devotion to that cause of union for which they gave the full measure of their devotion; that we here highly resolve that they shall not have labored in vain; that the world, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Union of the nations, by the nations, for the nations, shall not perish from the earth.”

**Confusion  
Confounded.**

The most conspicuous outstanding fact about individual and national thinking today is its utter confusion.

In flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention, for example, Great Britain is refusing to permit Red Cross supplies to be shipped from America to the central powers, and the activities of the Red Cross have been otherwise interfered with. Our own government has been impotent in its efforts to overcome the unjust and unjustifiable attitude of the allies and does not seem to know what to do next.

Cecil Rhodes hoped to promote international understanding and peace by establishing free scholarships at Oxford to certain high-class students from nations outside Great Britain. In his will, referring to the German scholarships, he said:

“I note the German Emperor has made instruction in English compulsory in German schools. I leave five yearly scholarships at Oxford of \$12,050 per annum to students of German birth, the scholars to be nominated by the German Emperor for the time being. Each scholarship to continue for three years, so that each year after the first three there will be fifteen scholars.”

We are now informed that the trustees of the will of Cecil Rhodes intend to apply to Parliament this session for a bill to abolish the Rhodes scholarship at Oxford allotted to German subjects. The trustees of this will are Lord Rosebery, Lord Grey, Lord Milner, Sir Starr Jameson, and Sir L. L. Michell. Such an attitude of mind on the part of the trustees represents not only a confusion of thinking, but a confusion of morals.

Readers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* must have been struck by the irreconcilable views of both clergymen and militarists on all matters relating to the most elementary features of American international policy. Newspapers like the *New York World* and the *New York Times* seem wholly unable to grasp the principle of true pacifism. It means to them weakness, sentimentalism, and failure; whereas the weakness, sentimentalism, and failure of the world is evidently that philosophy of violence, founded in a sad confusion of ideas, which has produced the world war.

All pending resolutions affecting foreign affairs of the United States were indefinitely postponed the other day because the Senate conceives the time to be “inopportune

for any action or expression of opinion relating to peace or war.” The Senate thereby confessed its inability to think out the problems of the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The bishops of England are unable to unravel the skein of thinking involved in the cases of conscientious objectors.

Dr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of “*Unity*,” thinks the peace societies are side-stepping and watchfully waiting in terms of a regrettable timidity and deliberate reaction; that they are parties to a “conspiracy of silence.” After still more caustic criticisms of the peace workers, he proceeds to plead for greater observance of the law of love and of the Golden Rule. Recognizing that this is a critical time in the history of civilization, he sets forth his own program in these enlightening words:

“We may not know what is best to do or how to do it, but as the Lord liveth, we should do something.”

Reverend Leyton Richards, pastor of the Bowdon-Downs Congregational Church of the Manchester District, England, has found it necessary to resign his pastorate, and in his letter of resignation he uses these words:

“I am ‘in a strait betwixt two.’ On the one side concern for the harmony and upbuilding of the Bowdon Church, which I see to be slowly crumbling before my eyes; and on the other side concern for the truth of the Gospel as I see it, and the life of Christ in the souls of men. That these two should come into conflict, as they do, is the real tragedy of the situation, and for me it constitutes a practical dilemma, for which I see but one exit: I must seek outside the ministry of this church that opportunity which I cannot honorably find within, of bearing witness to the faith I hold.”

The American students who have enjoyed the advantages of Rhodes’ scholarships at Oxford should be peculiarly fitted by experience and enlarged point of view to discuss the subject of preparedness with sanity. They have spent years abroad, mingled intimately with other nationalities, and lived and worked under governments differing from ours. They ought to have attained the international mind. It is of interest to find, therefore, in the “preparedness number” of the American *Oxonian* that 150 out of 350 of them vote for an increased military preparedness in the United States. Asked their opinion as to our liability to attack at the close of the war, 60 per cent declared the fear of such an attack “to be nonsense.” About 55 per cent are of the opinion that our actions have not increased this danger. Sixty per cent of those favoring preparedness believe that we should arm to enforce our conception of world amity, while 40 per cent would have us arm merely for self-defense. When these ex-scholars were asked their notion of the possibility of establishing a world court, only a

seventh of them regarded it favorably. But this seventh, say the editors, evidently included the most intelligent and forceful. Several deplored our present preparedness campaign "just at the moment when European nations might be disposed to take to heart the lesson that preparedness is a cause of war."

There are three kinds of activity—irrational activity, rational activity, and inactivity. There is always plenty of irrational activity and of inactivity. How we shall act and act rationally toward the international situation now confronting us is worthy of more clear thinking than is implied in these several instances.

**Collegiate Anti-Militarists vs. "Plattsburgers."**

"What effect did the summer training in a military camp have on your international outlook?" is the question recently posed by a group of college men, calling themselves the Collegiate Anti-militarist League. Answers were received from several hundred college students representing some 150 different institutions of learning throughout this country. They were scathing, excoriating answers. Youthful patriotism and idealism had been touched to the quick by the assumption that the months spent in the training camps had dwarfed the "Plattsburgers'" intellectual vision to the narrow subject of military preparedness. These answers, of which many are quoted in the League's publication *WAR?* boil down to four typical sorts, from which we quote:

1. "I felt astonished and insulted that a group of college students could seriously put out such literature."
2. "I find no indication that there is in my mind a desire for war, but I do find that there is a firm resolve that I will fight for my mother and my sister."
3. "After completing a course in such a camp a man begins to realize what the Stars and Stripes stand for. He realizes the necessity of military preparedness."
4. "We executed the details ourselves, down to sleeping in the wet. We dug trenches, hiked in rain, and ate as we found time. In this manner we learned what war really is—by practicing the game."

It is perhaps unnecessary to comment at length upon this amusing piffle. It represents four examples of misguided youthful patriotism, which might be aptly designated "the patriotism of pure unreason," "sentimental patriotism," "patriotism instilled," and "the patriotism of superfluous vitality." If we were a marauding, bandit nation, compelled to eke out our national subsistence by constant strife with our neighbors, at the mercy of or exposed to the constant danger of great military forces mobilized on our borders, these sentiments in our college-bred young men might be rewarded with the nation's gratitude.

We are, fortunately, nothing of this sort. We are a nation at peace with the world, the one great coherent

nation that is free and is likely to remain free from the rack and ruin across the ocean. We are the greatest national experiment in history with a record so far, in view of our youth, the unprecedented mixture of our population, and our great wealth and extent, of which we have every reason to be proud. The obvious duty before us is to take a dominant part in leading the rest of the world to understand the best in the idea of "Americanism." This, more than preparation for a vague and uncertain war-to-come, is the work for which the brightest intelligences and the best-trained minds in our midst should be fitting themselves. But does this call to duty ever urge the college Plattsburger to these difficult and inspiring deeds? Apparently not. He prefers the easy rigors of military discipline—easy because it is always easier to obey another than to learn to command one's self—to the real hardships of thought and labor for his country's and humanity's highest good. He gives desultory attention to the studies that are fitting him for responsibility and true Americanism, and looks forward eagerly to his make-believe bivouac and to the war-and-red-blood talk that will be hurled at him by his military counselors. Will the handful of collegiate "anti-militarists" and their *WAR?* be able to wake him from his dream?

**The Mexican Opportunity.**

In dangerous quarters and at night, when a rock is flung at your head, there are three courses to follow. Grope angrily in the dark, and you are likely to court injury; take to your heels, and you will undoubtedly incite pursuit. If you are wise, hold your ground, alert but unperturbed. President Wilson's first action anent the Carrizal affair was that of wisdom. Let us remember that we did not enter Mexico to pick a quarrel. We are there to attend strictly to our dangerous business of bandit-catching. We want neither Mexican territory nor Mexican humiliation, neither Mexican lives nor Mexican hostility. Mexico is the "sick man" of America. It is not pleasant to suffer the kicks and blows and revilings of its delirium, but we cannot rightly kill the patient whom we must cure. Better to call in help, if need be, which South America could not well refuse to give. Let there be among us only the firm, clear purpose to "heal the sick" and no talk of "retaliation," "blood for blood," or "wiping Mexico off the map"!

With tact and by keeping a firm rein upon our tempers, we have yet the opportunity to improve upon the ancient method of settling international disputes by blood only. "Damn, damn, damn the Mexicanos," is the old way. Firmness and dignity that rest upon law and righteousness is the new way. Let us "fight it out on this line, if it takes all Summer"!